

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/115,589	07/15/1998	JENNIFER E. VAN EYK	12917 1553 EXAMINER	
26259 75	590 11/24/2003			
LICATLA & TYRRELL P.C.			GUCKER, STEPHEN	
66 E. MAIN STREET MARLTON, NJ 08053			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1647	
			DATE MAILED: 11/24/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/115,589	VAN EYK ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Stephen Gucker	1647
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 27 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applical) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF		
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: <u>5</u> .		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6-28 and 53-55</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	roved or b) disapproved by the	he Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		

Continuation of 10. Other: The new limitation "wherein the presence of the myofilament protein modification product in the biological sample is associated with muscle damage" is still met by the prior art of record. See Wicks: irreversible cardiac damage from biological samples such as blood (pages 2-5) See Takahashi: assaying irreversible cardiac damage from biological samples such as blood (pages 2-5).

CARY KUNZ

TECHNOLOGY CE